

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

June 15, 2001

King County Natural Resources
8th Floor Conference Room
Seattle, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
James Peters	Olympia
John Roskelley	Spokane
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Joe Williams	Designee, Department of Ecology
Jerry Alb	Designee, Department of Transportation

Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. He apologized for the cancellation of the previously scheduled tour.

Doug Osterman, King County WRIA 9 lead entity coordinator, welcomed the Board. He discussed the history, geography, and land use of the WRIA 9 watershed. The limiting factors analysis is guiding the restoration strategy and other WRIA 9 planning efforts.

Mr. Osterman then introduced Charlie Coniff, Executive Director of the Environmental Coalition of South Seattle. Mr. Coniff discussed his organization's structure, history and its strategy for urban restoration in the Duwamish waterway. The organization is working with private and industrial landowners to further restoration efforts and community building of South Park along the Duwamish River.

After hearing from both Doug Osterman and Charlie Coniff, the Chair reinforced the importance of local involvement in the whole salmon restoration process and thanked them for their presentation.

Topic #1: Review and Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the May meeting are not yet completed. They will be presented at the next regular Board meeting.

Topic #2: Management and Status Reports

Financial Management Services Report: Debra Wilhelmi gave the update (see notebook for details). The latest version of the budget was discussed. The Chair mentioned the Federal House version has more money, however, Idaho is requesting additional money. The SRFB should get a larger amount of Federal money if the House version passes.

Legislative Report: Jim Fox reported on legislative actions (see notebook for details). Jim Fox reported there was little additional information since the last meeting.

Project Management Update: Rollie Geppert presented the project management update (see notebook for details). Application workshops are being scheduled directly with each lead entity. On June 25, there is a tour to show a staff member from the Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) salmon restoration activities in Washington.

Brenda McMurray recommended the application workshops be coordinated with the early technical panel interactions with the lead entities.

Jim Kramer discussed the differences in the purposes of the two meetings. The application workshop meetings will focus more on helping the project sponsors where the technical panel meetings focus more on the overall strategy of the watershed and would involve different individuals. The technical panel is still being established. Staff will work on overlapping as many of these meetings as possible when appropriate.

Topic #3: GSRO Report

No report was given at this meeting.

Topic #4: Nearshore Program Support

The Chair informed the group that formal action on this topic will be presented at the July SRFB meeting.

Tim Smith discussed the recently formed nearshore work group. Progress is being made, a budget and draft scope of work has been developed. He requested the topic be discussed at a later date after further development of the work items.

The Chair commented that this work is very important.

John Roskelley asked why this process was not going through the lead entities. Response: This is a large and complex project and many different groups are involved, including several lead entity groups. This project is a way to coordinate the efforts.

Public Testimony:

Janet Kearsley (WRIA 6) - Supports the project. She noted that lead entities with nearshore issues are involved in this project and are working closely with the Corps.

Board Discussion:

Craig Partridge asked if the Corps is looking favorably at using its Phase 1 money to match SRFB money for the kinds of assessments that are going to be useful for the state and the Board. Response: Yes, they have been participating in the scoping discussions and are very supportive of the efforts.

Brenda McMurray wants to make sure the lead entities are consulted with during and after the development of this project. She believes it is very important to work with the Corps of Engineers in development of this project.

No action was taken at this meeting. Formal discussion and decision will be made at July SRFB Meeting.

Topic #5a: Revised SRFB “Mission, Roles & Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy”

Jim Kramer and Jim Fox presented this agenda item (see notebook for details).

Jim Kramer reviewed the latest changes. He reviewed the history of “Mission, Roles and Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy” document. Policies will be used to review the lead entities’ strategy and project priority lists. This document also guides the technical panel and staff in their interactions with the lead entity groups when reviewing the strategies and priority lists.

Staff received very few comments on this document, however several people plan to testify.

Jim Fox noted that one change made to the document was the incorporation of references pertaining to the Watershed Planning Guidance Document developed by the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office.

Jim Kramer stressed the importance of adopting the application Manual (#18) at this meeting and that the “Mission, Roles & Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy” document can wait for final adoption until a later meeting. The Board may want to delay on adoption of the fish status and assessment policies until the Board has more discussion on the implications of these policies.

Fish Status:

Jim Fox reviewed the fish status policy draft in the document. This policy would clarify the Board’s stance when evaluating the benefits of lead entity lists and the projects on the list that benefit salmonid stocks that are essential for recovery. The Salmon Recovery Funding Act is not very clear in giving preference to naturally spawning stocks. The question is, does the Board need a policy in where to give preference? On the high priority end, there are the naturally spawning native fish at risk of extinction in habitat which could be restored. At the low priority end are nonnative hatchery produced fish in a habitat-limited watershed. Between those sideboards are many variations where it is hard to distinguish the priority level. Jim Fox suggested staff do

additional work on this policy before the Board considers adoption. He suggested a presentation at the next SRFB meeting for further discussion before adopting.

Jim Peters had concern with focusing on listed species. There are many species on the verge of being listed, for example coho. There needs to be a balance and other species should not be ignored.

Brenda McMurray believes the Board response/decision should be in line with the Governor's Statewide Salmon Recovery Strategy and NMFS in regards to this issue. She asked where the GSRO and NMFS are regarding this issue. Response: Technical Review Team (TRT) for NMFS or the recovery unit team for USFWS will list stocks or populations that are essential for recovery of that species in the ESU or distinct population segment. This could give the Board one possible choice for setting priorities. The Feds haven't done this yet. Staff from both NMFS and the GSRO was instrumental in development of the proposed SRFB fish status policy by providing technical review. This does not necessarily reflect the NMFS policy.

Jim Peters noted that in some instances stock may be "healthy" but habitat is very poor. Eventually this stock will be affected and may become "depressed." In previous funding cycles, funding has not been restricted and he does not understand why the Board needs to get this involved in deciding fish status priorities. The Chair commented that the Board may be forced into this issue and will need to address it at some point.

Steve Meyer expressed the need, due to limited funds, for the Board to spend money wisely. Also, the JLARC report requires the Board to document project success.

Craig Partridge noted the need to be in agreement with overall ESA goals. It is unknown if the SRFB can be helpful in bridging the gap between the ESA listings and when NMFS sets up goals.

Jim Kramer reported that staff has tried to clarify what the target of the Board's policy really is. The big question is how are largely hatchery-managed systems handled? Current state and federal policy is not clear.

Public Testimony:

Jay Watson HCCC Lead Entity – The effort is needed but has large repercussions. He has not had enough time to review this document. Would like to have this document reviewed by LEAG. Lead entities do need additional guidance from SRFB but not at the last minute. There may be a problem if there is a change in the process late in this grant cycle.

David Troutt, Nisqually Lead Entity – Agrees with Jay that this should be sent to LEAG for review. The document is too far out in front of the curve in reference to the hatchery reform plan. Nisqually Fall Chinook (hatchery stock presently) could be rated either high or low depending. Each watershed should be looked at individually. Each lead entity should be allowed to develop its own priorities. The document needs additional work.

Paul Ward, Yakama Nation – The Yakama Nation deals with 7 or 8 different lead entities. The Yakama Nation supports developing this policy at a higher level than the lead entity level. Most restoration work will benefit all stocks present in the watershed.

Jeff Breckel, LCFRB Lead Entity – The Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board has been working on a stock priority policy for the last five months. It went through all stream systems and looked at stock status. Some systems have a variety of stocks at different statuses. They did not take into account abundance (or contribution) of some stocks. They have still not gotten a policy developed. He would like to see something to help them set priorities; however, he does not feel stock policy can be adopted during this grant cycle without causing problems with the lead entity ranking process.

Bob Metzger, USFS - He supports the Board's efforts to prioritize. The Board's system needs to fit well with other systems. Suggested looking at system USFS uses, although it may not help statewide since it is focused on federal lands. Species on proposed list need to be included.

Janet Kearsley, Island County Lead Entity - Their lead entity area has all known species in watersheds, but specific information on each stream is unknown. These estuaries are feeding all salmon species at different life stages and are part of the food web.

Board Decision:

Jim Fox recommended not acting on this policy until a later date. Manual #18 will need to be updated to reflect this change by striking all the fish status language on page 23 and defaulting to current policy in this grant cycle.

The Chair asked for clarification on some approaches to assist the technical panel but without confusing the lead entities.

Staff was asked to come back at the next meeting with a short-term recommendation to help the technical panel in rating projects and then bring the longer-term policy recommendation back to the Board after more discussion and review.

Assessments:

Jim Kramer reviewed the assessment memorandum presented in the notebook.

Chris Drivdahl, GSRO – The GSRO would like some modifications in reference to the *Watershed Assessment Guidance*.

GSRO believes the Watershed Planning Document should be used in selection or support of all kinds of projects, not just assessments. Changes need to be made throughout document. Suggested changes:

- Amend language in section B. SRFB Funding Policies to reference Section 3 of the *Guidance on Watershed Assessment for Salmon* document – “Recommend that project proponents use Section 3 of guidance to provide the Board with the kinds of assessments that they have done to support the projects they are proposing to the Board.”

- Also recommends that the Board not require the lead entities use this document in this grant cycle but signal to the lead entities that in the next grant cycle require use of this document. “The Board will give preference to projects and project lists that are supported by sufficient assessment information as outlined in the *Guidance on Watershed Assessment for Salmon* document in future grant cycles.”

The Chair would like clear direction to the lead entities on the future use of the *Watershed Assessment Guidance*.

Brenda McMurray does not feel the Board is ready to recommend use of the document or to imply the Board will adopt it in the future.

Jim Kramer summarized the Board’s direction to staff, which is to follow the recommendation in the staff memo, add additional information on availability of document watershed assessment guidance and encourage lead entities to use it.

The Board continued to discuss the watershed assessment guidance document and how to use it in the future. Other large-scale watershed assessments were also discussed, such as the 2514 watershed planning process. These two processes have some overlap and although some coordination exists now, additional coordination needs to be encouraged. There are still data gaps that need to be filled.

Joe Williams presented information on Ecology’s 2514 watershed planning process and discussed how to interweave this process with the Board’s policy guidance. In many of the limiting factors analyses both water quality and water quantity issues are addressed, the watershed planning units are required to address these limiting factor issues. Joe summarized that “the SRFB would support the coordination of these related efforts, recognize that adequate flows and good water quality are important elements in salmon recovery and encourage watershed lead agencies to become involved in the SRFB process by providing the comments on ongoing funding process and overall strategy and to identify projects in association with the lead entities.”

Joe asked that this information be included in the Board’s “Mission” document to strengthen coordination by the lead agencies. The Board discussed the need for including this information in the Board’s policy document.

Public Testimony:

Jay Watson HCCC - Has four 2514 planning units in his area and finds it difficult to attend all meetings. Believes the first step in the coordination process would be to have Ecology and WDFW develop some guidance to help the groups with coordination since the groups are working at a different scale. The coordination works in one half of the 2514 groups. What about the other half? What does it mean as far as the amount of time to do additional coordination? He is concerned with additional time required.

Paul Ward, Yakama Nation – 2514 process has had difficulties in the Klickitat area. The Tribe and environmental groups are no longer at the table in the Yakima area. Imposing a relationship of the two bodies would create additional difficulties.

Board Discussion and Consensus:

The Chair suggested the language only encourage coordination. This topic should be put before the LEAG. Language needs to be clear and brought to the next meeting before adding to the policy document. Joe will work with staff to revise the language for possible inclusion in the Board's policy document after review and approval by both the LEAG and the SRFB.

Topic #5b: Revised 3rd Round Guidelines, Applications, and Policy Issues

Debra Wilhelmi and Rollie Geppert presented this agenda item (see notebook for details).

Debra Wilhelmi gave an overview of the applications and policy issues. There are still several unresolved issues that need to be discussed on eligible/ineligible projects.

Brenda McMurray asked about the make-up of the lead entities' technical review committees and citizen committees. Response: Phil Trask (WDFW) will gather the information and present it to the Board in a separate document.

The Chair asked about the interaction of the Board's technical review committee and the lead entity reviews. Response: Staff has included additional time for the Board's technical review committee to write its recommendations and then send to the lead entity committees for review and comment before presenting the final information to the Board. This adds an additional two weeks to the funding process.

Eligible/ineligible:

Silvicultural Treatments/Other Forest Practices (currently ineligible):

Discussion of Forest and Fish current funding (\$4 million) and where this money will be used.

Craig Partridge discussed the similarity between funding silviculture treatments and funding a culvert project where the landowner is legally responsible to correct. DNR will be assisting small forest landowners with costs.

Jim Peters noted the obligation in the Forest and Fish plan is that industry would take care of those projects on their lands and would not be supported by state funds. Believes they should continue to be ineligible.

Larry Cassidy wondered if there is a way to incorporate in a way to lessen the overlap but fill the gaps since this is not a black and white issue.

The Chair recommends that forest and fish agreement projects remain ineligible, as he hasn't heard any recommendations to make them eligible by other Board members. Staff should look at possible gaps.

Sediment Ponds (currently eligible), Irrigation (currently eligible), and Water Reclamation Projects (not previously addressed by the Board):

After discussion, the Board agreed all be considered on a case-by-case basis, to ensure the project would benefit fish.

Engineered Log Jams (ELJ) (currently eligible):

Discussed the recently approved monitoring project for the current projects. The Board agreed that ELJs should not be eligible for the next two years.

Nearshore and Forage Fish (currently eligible):

Discussion of the nearshore assessment the Corps of Engineers is developing.

Brenda McMurray pointed out that the proposed nearshore Corps project does not include Lower Columbia. She would like to keep this type eligible; look on a case-by-case basis.

Jim Peters would like to allow nearshore project to remain eligible, but notify the lead entities that they may not get funded.

Chair mentioned that the Board could exclude Puget Sound but allow nearshore projects in Lower Columbia.

Brenda McMurray would like to let the Puget Sound area to remain eligible also.

Public Testimony

Dwight Pelz, King County Councilperson and Chair of the WRIA 9 Citizen Committee - Discussed the WRIA 9 planning effort. This group has developed its key products and milestones document that everyone in this WRIA group follows. This document is helpful in giving the group something to work for and developments of needed products. He did note that it would be helpful in the planning process to know what the recovery goals are for NMFS and the shared strategy.

Janet Kearsley, Island County Lead Entity - Recommends nearshore projects be eligible. Their nearshore project is a two-year project yet only requested one year of funding. If nearshore projects are not eligible, they will be unable to complete their project. She would recommend the Board not make nearshore projects ineligible.

Brenda McMurray believes the lead entities will only propose legitimate nearshore projects and would like to continue to keep nearshore projects eligible.

Jim Kramer recommends allowing nearshore projects but requiring the sponsor to coordinate with any ongoing efforts, to ensure the project is not duplicative, or show that it fills a data gap.

Board Consensus:

Nearshore projects will remain eligible, however Puget Sound projects will have to ensure they are coordinated with the larger effort.

Topic #5c: Finalization and Adoption of Topics 5a and 5b

Resolution #2001-10 was revised to be consistent with the preceding discussions. Revisions include removing reference to the draft *Mission, Roles and Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy* document, including the eligible/ineligible projects list approved at

this meeting, deleting first page of Appendix A, and clarifying language on the use of the *GSRO Watershed Assessment Guidance*.

John Roskelley **Moved** to adopt Resolution #2001-10 as amended. Jim Peters **Seconded**. Board approved. Resolution #2001-10 **passed as amended**.

Mission, Roles and Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy Document

Two issues remain unresolved: inclusion of wording concerning the 2514 planning process, and the fish status priorities.

Staff noted that the Board could either adopt the draft *Mission, Roles and Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy* without the items and then amend in the future, or postpone adoption of the entire document until the two issues have been resolved.

The Chair would like to adopt what the Board can agree on and then amend as necessary.

Brenda McMurray **Moved** to adopt *Mission, Roles* document without the fish status priorities or 2514 planning information text. John Roskelley **Seconded** the motion. **Approved**.

Topic #6: Monitoring Strategy

Carole Richmond presented this agenda item (see notebook for details). She discussed the strategy and the timeline of the Monitoring Oversight Committee. The first meeting will be June 29, 2001, in Olympia at the Department of Information Board Room. A monitoring project manager will be hired soon.

Topic #7: Technical Panel – Confirm Appointments and Review Schedule

Jim Kramer updated the Board on the status of the Technical Panel appointments and schedule. Approximately one half of last year's participants will remain on the panel. Jim is still searching for additional members. The Panel should be complete within a couple of weeks. Jim would like to schedule the early meetings with lead entities around the end of July. An ad hoc group will review nearshore projects. Meetings with lead entities will be in their areas. Early meetings should focus on strategy and some discussion of projects with the citizens committee.

The Chair asked if Board members would authorize him, Jim Kramer, and Laura Johnson to confirm the appointment of the Panel members. The Board approved this action.

Partner Agency Reports

Jerry Alb, WSDOT - Discussed the ESB 6188, the Transportation Permit Efficiency bill, recently passed. This bill forms a Transportation Efficiency and Accountability Committee to be more accountable for the millions of dollars received by DOT. One area of concern is the time it takes to get permits; this committee is also to look at ways

to accelerate the project review process. They will be looking to integrate transportation planning with watershed planning. Jerry offered a presentation before the Board to explain this Committee and its work at a future meeting.

The next SRFB meeting will be on July 19 and 20th. There is a tour on the 19th in conjunction with the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. On the evening of the 19th there will be a dinner and discussion with the Upper Columbia Fish Recovery Board.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: July 19 & 20, 2001 – East Wenatchee
 September 6 & 7, 2001 – Port Angeles
 October 18 & 19, 2001 - Bellingham
 December 6 & 7, 2001 – Tacoma/Puyallup

ACTION ITEM

SRFB RESOLUTION #2001-10

Third Round 2001 Grant Cycle Policies, Guidelines and Application Materials

WHEREAS, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) will begin its third grant cycle in July, 2001, and

WHEREAS, the SRFB requested and received public comments to the draft Policy Manual #18 and draft application materials; and

WHEREAS, staff incorporated Board comments from the May 23, 2001, meeting and took into consideration public comments in revision of these draft documents; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered public comments on these revised documents;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board approves for use in the Third Round 2001 the SRFB Policy Manual #18, *Policies and Project Selection*; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board authorizes staff to incorporate the Board's amendments and make other minor editorial changes in these documents before final publication.

Resolution moved by: _____ John Roskelley _____

Resolution seconded by: _____ Jim Peters _____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline result)

Date: ____ June 15, 2001 _____

ACTION ITEM

SRFB Mission, Roles and Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy Document

Brenda McMurray moved to adopt the SRFB *Mission, Roles and Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy* without inclusion of the fish status priorities or 2514 planning information. John Roskelley seconded. Board approved.

ACTION ITEM

Technical Panel Confirmation

The Chair asked if Board members would authorize him, Jim Kramer, and Laura Johnson to confirm the appointment of the Panel members. The Board approved this action.

G:\TammyO\SRFB Meetings\June 14 & 15, 2001\6_15_01 Minutes.doc